



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

prominent part THE REVIEW has played in forming this great Republic of ours. We see, from the letters passed between Jefferson and Adams, that great men differed in their opinions as to war and its maintenance then as well as now.

I have had the pleasure of reading but one other copy of THE REVIEW besides the January number of 1915. I am delighted with it and am sorry that the people in Georgia and in the South are not thirsty for such periodicals as it is. I regret that the inferior periodicals of fiction and romance fill the news-stands down here instead of such bounteous storehouses of knowledge as THE REVIEW. I hope to witness the day when all the news-stands in our Southland will have to supplant the inferior periodicals with such as THE REVIEW, causing us to aspire to a higher plane of knowledge.

I realize what the trouble is down here. Our people are not educated to think for themselves and do not realize their duty in regard to education. We need an awakening along this line.

I see the need of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW in every home in our Southland, and, were each home advanced in culture to appreciate it, we would develop a high standard of civilization, attaining a *real true democratic republic*.

I felt duty bound to express to you and your associated writers my appreciation of your ancient as well as up-to-date periodical through this medium.

ROBERT L. MILLER.

MONROE, GA.

#### DOES PROHIBITION PROHIBIT?

SIR,—I wish to make a confession and a request.

I do not like to go on record with an admission of failure in anything, and yet after seven years of iteration and reiteration it seems to me that I have not succeeded in making clear two points that are most frequently discussed in connection with the liquor problem.

One of these is that "prohibition" is not intended to prohibit. The second is that dragon's-tooth question, "Why, if prohibition does not prohibit, do the liquor men oppose prohibition?"

Having made my confession, I wish now to make my request, and this is, that you give careful consideration to the following very earnest attempt to make clear these points.

Not long ago, the Rev. Charles M. Sheldon, one of the members of one of the prohibition flying squadrons, was speaking in Chicago, and in the course of his speech said:

I was in New York. I found a little girl three years old, working with her hands to make a few cents at eight o'clock at night.

There are many hundreds such in New York.

That child's father is a drunkard. There are thousands of such drunkards and of such children in the cities of this country.

We purpose to abolish the drunkard and rescue the child.

On such grounds is the prohibition movement based. The prohibition oration pictures actual or exaggerated evils growing out of the abuse of the use of liquor, and then proceeds to demand, not the abolition of the use of liquor, but what is called the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of liquor.

With the possible exception of one case, now being tested in the courts,

there is in America to-day, after more than half a century of prohibition agitation and legislation, not one prohibition law that prevents the lawful purchase, possession, and use of liquor; nor is there a prohibition law that is intended to prevent even the drunkard from obtaining a drink.

Only in license territory are there laws against furnishing liquor to inebriates. There is not a drunkard in all the prohibition territory in the United States who has not the lawful right to purchase, possess, and use liquor, and I charge that this lawful right to purchase liquor has been preserved for the drunkard, even as it has been preserved for the liquor-drinking prohibitionist, by the Anti-Saloon League of America and by the Prohibition party.

Why, in the State of Kentucky, at the last session of the Legislature the Anti-Saloon League of Kentucky pushed through our Legislature a bill repealing the law that prevented the shipping of liquor from the license counties of Kentucky to those that were under prohibition. The reason for this was that the county-option movement had come to a standstill in Kentucky.

Under the old law, citizens in prohibition counties had the right to order and receive from Kentucky dealers, provided it was sent out of the state before being sent to the prohibition county. This was inconvenient and often caused some little delay in obtaining liquor supplies; and because it proved unpopular in the prohibition counties and because the Anti-Saloon League intended to call elections in other counties and hoped to win them, it caused the repeal of this "inconvenient law." The result is that now, under a law passed by the Legislature at the request of the Anti-Saloon League, liquor can be shipped from any county in Kentucky to any other county in Kentucky.

This is a sample of the kind of legislation that the Anti-Saloon League offers for putting a stop to drunkenness and for keeping three-year-old children from having to work for a living.

Dr. Henry Smith Williams has expressed this point so clearly in an article in *The Ladies' Home Journal* that I would like to quote him as follows:

To me, at least, it seems obvious that the only thing that has kept the prohibition movement before the people of the United States is the simple fact that prohibition does not prohibit.

The prohibitionists continue to drum it into the ears of the people that prohibition does not prohibit because the liquor men will not permit it to prohibit, whereas the actual truth is that prohibition does not prohibit because the prohibitionists will actively fight the adoption of any law intended to cut off the individual's supply of liquor in prohibition territory.

When confronted with these facts, the Anti-Saloon League's speakers and writers do not deny them. They seek to beg the question by repeating the query, "Why, if prohibition does not prohibit, do the liquor men oppose prohibition?"

By asking this question, they get the public's mind away from the more pertinent question, "Why, if prohibition is not intended to prohibit, does the Anti-Saloon League solicit funds in behalf of prohibition?" Or, "Why, if prohibition does not prohibit, is prohibition supposed to prevent either the use or the abuse of liquor?"

The men who have invested their money and time and labor in the various branches of the liquor business and in collateral trades object to prohibition individually because it threatens to, and often does, destroy the business

of individuals, and it is only natural that these individuals should work together in opposition to prohibition.

The retailer opposes prohibition because prohibition destroys his right to continue in the liquor business in the locality where prohibition is adopted.

The wholesaler objects to prohibition because it puts his customer, the retailer, out of business and to that extent breaks up his established trade.

The distiller objects to prohibition because what hurts the wholesaler interferes with the distiller's established trade.

But these individual losses do not bring about a loss to the liquor business as a whole. The business that is lawfully done under the license system through the saloon is done lawfully under the mail-order system in prohibition territory.

Of course, if we had nation-wide prohibition, the distilleries as at present conducted would be put out of business; but even nation-wide prohibition, as proposed by Mr. Hobson's resolution recently defeated, would not reduce the consumption of alcoholic beverages, because the adroit measure, while purporting to prevent the manufacture of liquor for sale and the transportation of liquor for sale, would permit the manufacture and transportation of liquor for use.

Under nation-wide prohibition, as proposed by the Congressional spokesman for the Anti-Saloon League, present-day moonshine stills, which the Federal authorities are unable to suppress in prohibition territory, would have the right to manufacture liquor without hindrance from revenue officers.

Every farmer could have his still-house and his winery, and as it would be lawful to sell liquor for medicinal purposes, there is no reason to suppose that even nation-wide prohibition, as proposed by the Anti-Saloon League, is intended to prohibit either the use or the abuse of liquor.

As the situation now stands, the prohibitionists are demanding that the States surrender their police powers, centralize government at Washington, confiscate private property without compensation, make a mockery of civil liberty and local self-government, and all for the purpose of sustaining in affluence the promoters of a movement that is not even intended to reduce the use of liquor.

That the prohibition movement has not reduced the consumption of liquor is shown by the following accurate table, compiled from the Government's revenue records:

Fiscal Year	Per Capita Distilled Spirits (Gallons)	Per Capita Fermented Liquors (Gallons)	Total Per Capita (Gallons)
1896.....	.86	15.66	16.52
1914.....	1.38	20.74	22.12

Total increase—Annual per capita, 5.60 gallons.

Considering these facts—and they are facts—don't you think that the prohibition movement has reached a point where its sincerity should be questioned and its leaders called upon to show cause for their demand for prohibition that is not intended to prohibit?

LOUISVILLE, Ky.

I am, sir,  
J. M. GILMORE,  
President National Model License League.